

Examiner is required to concisely state particular reasons for requiring a restriction.

The relationship between the embodiments of the invention illustrated in Fig. 2 and Fig. 9 is clearly set forth in the Detailed Description. See discussion of inserts in paragraphs 00059 through 00062, an embodiment of the invention is described. The Examiner is required to provide support for the restriction requirement, e.g., why "there would be a significant burden on the examiner if restriction is not required."


There is a relationship disclosed between the Examiner's species. There are no discussions nor reasons why the discussion, e.g., paragraphs 00059 through 00062 do not prevent restriction. See MPEP 808.01(a).

Finally, the Examiner gives no explanation "why there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required." See MPEP 808.02, (A), (B), and (C).

III. CONCLUSION

Applicant has elected Species I, allowed claims stated above draw to Fig. 2 with traverse and has canceled all claims stated above drawn to Fig. 9 not elected. If the Examiner has support or an analysis that supports the restriction requirement, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner substantiate this position in greater detail. Otherwise, it is respectfully requested that the restriction requirement be withdrawn. Applicant requests a timely processing of the allowed claims and the issuance of a Notice of Allowance and Issue Fee due.

Respectfully submitted,



John W. Kepler III
Registration #30397
Gallop, Johnson & Neuman, L.C.
101 South Hanley Road, Suite 1700
St. Louis, MO 63105
ip@gjn.com

Area Code: 314
Telephone: 615-6000
Facsimile: 615-6001